

U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management  
White River Field Office  
73544 Hwy 64  
Meeker, CO 81641

## ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

**NUMBER:** CO-110-2005-035 -EA

**CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER** (optional): COD-037696

**PROJECT NAME:** Pipeline for well#T73X-19G

**LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** T.2S, R.95W, SENE sec.19, 6thP.M.

**APPLICANT:** ExxonMobil Oil Corporation

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES:**

**Proposed Action:** The applicant proposes to install a buried 2" steel flow line from the well head #T73X-19G to a tie in point (3600' x 50' ROW) at an existing pipeline to return the well into production.

The pipeline would be installed in/under the existing access road. Additional surface disturbance would be approximately 1.7 acres (50' ROW -30' existing road ROW = 20' X 3600' = 1.7 ac.)

Equipment staging area will be located on existing production locations near the construction site. Water breaks will be constructed and revegetation will be performed to BLM standards.

**No Action Alternative:** No additional environmental consequences would occur.

**NEED FOR THE ACTION:** To respond to request by applicant to exercise lease rights and develop hydrocarbon reserves.

**PLAN CONFORMANCE REVIEW:** The Proposed Action is subject to and has been reviewed for conformance with the following plan (43 CFR 1610.5, BLM 1617.3):

Name of Plan: White River Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan (ROD/RMP).

Date Approved: July 1, 1997

Decision Number/Page: Pages 2-49 thru 2-52

Decision Language: “To make public lands available for the siting of public and private facilities through the issuance of applicable land use authorizations, in a manner that provides for reasonable protection of other resource values.”

## **AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT / ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES / MITIGATION MEASURES:**

**STANDARDS FOR PUBLIC LAND HEALTH:** In January 1997, Colorado Bureau of Land Management (BLM) approved the Standards for Public Land Health. These standards cover upland soils, riparian systems, plant and animal communities, threatened and endangered species, and water quality. Standards describe conditions needed to sustain public land health and relate to all uses of the public lands. Because a standard exists for these five categories, a finding must be made for each of them in an environmental analysis. These findings are located in specific elements listed below:

### **CRITICAL ELEMENTS**

#### **AIR QUALITY**

*Affected Environment:* There are no special designation air sheds or non-attainment areas nearby that would be affected by the proposed action. During periods of low precipitation, air quality in the area of the proposed action is often diminished by dust caused by human disturbance.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* The proposed action would result in short term, local impacts to air quality during and after construction, due to dust being blown into the air. After adequate vegetation is reestablished, blowing dust should return to pre-construction levels.

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* No increase in dust will occur.

*Mitigation:* No additional mitigation is needed.

#### **CULTURAL RESOURCES**

*Affected Environment:* The proposed pipeline route has been inventoried at the Class III (100% pedestrian) level (Hilman and Metcalf 1978, Compliance Dated 8/12/1978). The route was inventoried to a 100 foot width, 50 feet either side of the original well tie pipeline centerline with no cultural resources identified during the inventory.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* The proposed action will not impact any known cultural resources. There should be no impacts to cultural resources if mitigation measures are strictly adhered to.

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* There would be no new impacts to cultural resources under the No Action Alternative.

*Mitigation:* 1. The operator is responsible for informing all persons who are associated with the project operations that they will be subject to prosecution for knowingly disturbing historic or archaeological sites, or for collecting artifacts. If historic or archaeological materials are uncovered during any project or construction activities, the operator is to immediately stop activities in the immediate area of the find that might further disturb such materials, and immediately contact the authorized officer (AO). Within five working days the AO will inform the operator as to:

- whether the materials appear eligible for the National Register of Historic Places
- the mitigation measures the operator will likely have to undertake before the site can be used (assuming in situ preservation is not necessary)
- a timeframe for the AO to complete an expedited review under 36 CFR 800-11 to confirm, through the State Historic Preservation Officer, that the findings of the AO are correct and that mitigation is appropriate.

If the operator wishes, at any time, to relocate activities to avoid the expense of mitigation and/or the delays associated with this process, the AO will assume responsibility for whatever recordation and stabilization of the exposed materials may be required. Otherwise, the operator will be responsible for mitigation cost. The AO will provide technical and procedural guidelines for the conduct of mitigation. Upon verification from the AO that the required mitigation has been completed, the operator will then be allowed to resume construction.

2. Pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(g) the holder of this authorization must notify the AO, by telephone, with written confirmation, immediately upon the discovery of human remains, funerary items, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony. Further, pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(c) and (d), you must stop activities in the vicinity of the discovery and protect it for 30 days or until notified to proceed by the authorized officer.

3. All disturbances from construction activity for the new flow line must remain within 50 foot either side of the proposed flow line route and between the existing line and the well pad access road.

## **INVASIVE, NON-NATIVE SPECIES**

*Affected Environment:* The principal noxious weeds known to occur in the vicinity of the proposed action are black henbane, houndstongue and mullein. The invasive alien cheatgrass also occurs on un-revegetated areas of earthen disturbance associated with locations, pipelines and access roads.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* The proposed action will create about 1.7 acres of earthen disturbance which if it is not promptly recontoured and revegetated will provide safe sites for the invasion and proliferation of noxious weeds and cheatgrass (promptly means seeding immediately after the pipeline is recontoured and waterbarred).

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* There will be no change from the present situation.

*Mitigation:* The operator will be responsible for eradicating all noxious, problem and invasive species on the pipeline right of way using materials and methods approved in advance by the Authorized Officer.

## **MIGRATORY BIRDS**

*Affected Environment:* The proposed pipeline route parallels an existing well access road through a mixed mountain, big sagebrush-Utah serviceberry vegetation type. There are a number of migratory birds that fulfill nesting functions in this community from late May through mid July. Birds of higher conservation interest associated with the shrub-steppe type (i.e., Colorado Partners in Flight program) include the green-tailed towhee and Brewer's sparrow, species that are abundant and widely distributed throughout the Resource Area.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* The proposed pipeline is scheduled to be installed in February 2005, prior to the return of nesting migratory birds. In the unlikely event this project is delayed into the nesting season, surface disturbance would extend about 20 feet off the roadside-an area that likely assumes little to no bird nesting activity. Indirect construction-related effects during the nesting season may extend up to 100 feet from the edge of the right-of-way, influencing nesting efforts on up to 16 acres of shrubland habitat. Based on average nest shrub-steppe nest densities in close proximity to roads, construction activity during the nesting peak may disrupt nesting of up to 4 pair of birds of higher conservation interest. This level of impact would have no measurable influence on affected populations of migratory birds at any landscape scale.

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* There would be no action authorized that would have potential to further influence migratory bird nesting activity.

*Mitigation:* None.

## **THREATENED, ENDANGERED, AND SENSITIVE ANIMAL SPECIES (includes a finding on Standard 4)**

*Affected Environment:* There are no animals listed, proposed, or candidate to the Endangered Species Act that are know to inhabit or derive important benefit from areas potentially influenced by the proposed action.

The Magnolia area supports a remnant population of greater sage-grouse, a BLM sensitive species. Suitable habitat for this bird is relegated to sagebrush ridgelines that remain relatively free of serviceberry expression. Currently, primary sage-grouse distribution occurs west of the project site, though grouse likely continue to make incidental use of the project area. Sage-grouse reproductive activity (communal displays on leks) occurs from mid-March through early May. Although absent over the past 2-3 years, the Magnolia birds formerly displayed at a site immediately adjacent to RBC 3 about 4 miles west of the project site—a point likely used for construction access. Nesting activity commences by mid-April and continues through mid-July.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* This proposed project would likely be constructed in February 2005 prior to the reproductive activities of sage-grouse. Traffic and construction activity along existing corridors is expected to have little influence on the distribution or energy budgets of wintering birds. In the event construction is delayed into the seasons of reproductive display, heavy and concentrated construction activity would be expected to disrupt lekking activity if grouse continued to strut in close proximity to the road. BLM and Division of Wildlife biologists are intending on making a concerted effort to locate Magnolia's current lek site in the spring of 2005. Pending the leks location relative to RBC 3, a timing limitation of up to 60 days may be installed on this project, generally restricting construction outside the period of March 15 to May 15.

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* There would be no action authorized that would have potential to disrupt activities or distribution of sage-grouse.

*Mitigation:* Pending the leks location relative to RBC 3, a timing limitation of up to 60 days may be installed on this project, generally restricting construction outside the period of March 15 to May 15. There are a number of mitigating features that the applicant may incorporate that would alter the eventual application of this condition of approval, including use of the Cascade Gulch road and use of diel activity restrictions.

*Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for Threatened & Endangered species:* The proposed action would have no conceivable influence on populations or habitats associated with federally listed animals and would, therefore, have no potential to influence the status or application of applicable land health standards.

Although sagebrush habitats on Magnolia continue to support a small and reproducing population of sage-grouse, the land health standards are not fully satisfied, since the birds' populations are severely depressed and advanced vegetation succession has drastically limited the extent of suitable habitat. At this point in time, ongoing oil and gas production activities may have minor influences on grouse in the context of indirect habitat loss (i.e., avoidance response of disturbances), but the greatest effectors of downward trends are decidedly advanced vegetation succession and the influences of historic livestock grazing (e.g., ground cover density and composition). The proposed action, as conditioned, would influence sage-grouse habitats that could only be categorized as marginal, if not unsuitable, and the application of timing limitations would be sufficient to disassociate potentially disruptive construction activities from important reproductive functions of grouse. The no-action and proposed action, as conditioned,

would have no effective influence on the status or application of the land health standards as applied to special status species.

## **WASTES, HAZARDOUS OR SOLID**

*Affected Environment:* There are no known hazardous or other solid wastes on the subject lands. No hazardous materials are known to have been used, stored or disposed of at sites included in the project area.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* No listed or extremely hazardous materials in excess of threshold quantities are proposed for use in this project. While commercial preparations of fuels and lubricants proposed for use may contain some hazardous constituents, they would be stored, used and transported in a manner consistent with applicable laws, and the generation of hazardous wastes would not be anticipated. Solid wastes would be properly disposed of.

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* No hazardous or other solid wastes would be generated under the no-action alternative.

*Mitigation:* The operator shall be required to collect and properly dispose of any solid wastes generated by the proposed actions.

## **WATER QUALITY, SURFACE AND GROUND (includes a finding on Standard 5)**

*Affected Environment:* The proposed action is located in the Dry Fork Piceance Creek watershed, which is tributary to Piceance creek and the White River. A review of the Colorado's 1989 Nonpoint Source Assessment Report (plus updates), the 305(b) report, the 303(d) list and the Unified Watershed Assessment was done to see if any water quality concerns have been identified. All actions are within the White River watershed.

The State has classified this segment as a "Use Protected" reach. Its designated beneficial uses are: Warm Aquatic Life 2, Recreation 2, and Agriculture. The antidegradation review requirements in the Antidegradation Rule are not applicable to waters designated use-protected. For those waters, only the protection specified in each reach will apply. For this reach, minimum standards for three parameters have been listed. These parameters are: dissolved oxygen = 5.0 mg/l, pH = 6.5 - 9.0, Fecal Coliform = 2000/100 ml, and 630/100 ml E. coli. This segment retained its Recreation Class 2 designation after sufficient evidence was received that a Recreation Class 1a use was unattainable.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* One problem that could arise from the proposed action would be an increase in sediment transport. Annual runoff from this watershed is dynamic and dependent on some aspects we control, such as the amount of vegetation retained for watershed protection and vegetation density. Depleting the vegetation cover needed to protect watersheds from raindrop impact and runoff could cause short-term

erosion problems and increased sedimentation to Piceance Creek and on down to the White River until successful Best Management Practices (BMPs) have been implemented and prove to be successful. The magnitude of these impacts is dependent on the amount of surface disturbance and climatic conditions during the time the soils are exposed to the elements.

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* Impacts from the no-action alternative are not anticipated.

*Mitigation:* When preparing the site off the road bed, all suitable topsoil should be stripped from the surface of the location and stockpiled for reclamation once the pipeline is installed.

All activity shall cease when soils or road surfaces become saturated to a depth of three inches unless otherwise approved by the Authorized Officer.

Provide vegetative or artificial stabilization of cut and fill slopes in the design process. Avoid establishment of vegetation where it inhibits drainage from the road surface or where it restricts safety or maintenance.

*Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for water quality:* The proposed action will not affect water quality or achievement of the Land Health Standard.

#### **CRITICAL ELEMENTS NOT PRESENT OR NOT AFFECTED:**

No ACEC's, flood plains, prime and unique farmlands, or Wild and Scenic Rivers, threatened, endangered or sensitive plants exist within the area affected by the proposed action. For threatened, endangered and sensitive plant species Public Land Health Standard is not applicable since neither the proposed nor the no-action alternative would have any influence on populations of, or habitats potentially occupied by, special status plants. There are also no Native American religious or environmental justice concerns associated with the proposed action.

#### **NON-CRITICAL ELEMENTS**

The following elements **must** be addressed due to the involvement of Standards for Public Land Health:

##### **SOILS** (includes a finding on Standard 1)

*Affected Environment:* Baseline soils data have been collected for Rio Blanco County by the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) and are published in order III Soil Surveys. These surveys are available for review from the White River Field Office. The table below identifies soil characteristics for the soils encountered from the proposed action

Soil Number	Soil Name	Slope	Range site	Salinity	Run Off	Erosion Potential	Depth to Bedrock
42	Irigul channery loam	5-50%	Loamy Slopes	<2	Medium to rapid	Very high	10-20"
43	Irigul-Parachute complex	12-45% 5-30%	Loamy Slopes/Mountain Loam	<2	Rapid	Slight to high	10-20"

The flow line does not have any special delineation assigned to the soils encountered by the proposed action.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* General impacts associated with oil and gas and road development include but are not limited to, loss of topsoil, soil compaction and possible increase in sediment loads to the White River. The primary surface-disturbing impact would be a potential increase in sediment transport from runoff events after the protective vegetative cover has been removed and before successful reclamation has occurred. Since the disturbed area will be primarily in the road ROW, impacts are expected to be minimal. Using BMPs to slow runoff, trap sediment and prepare reclaimed areas for seeding on the area outside of the road bed would help reduce soil loss. Impact to water quality is expected to be short in duration, during the construction phase and for a short time after construction until successful reclamation is achieved.

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* Impacts are not anticipated from not permitting the proposed action.

*Mitigation:* Slopes within the disturbed area shall be stabilized by non-vegetative practices designed to hold the soil in place and minimize erosion. Vegetative cover shall be reestablished to increase infiltration and provide additional protection from erosion.

When erosion is anticipated for any new disturbance off the road bed proper, sediment barriers shall be constructed to slow runoff, allow deposition of sediment, and prevent it from leaving the site. In addition, straining or filtration mechanisms may also contribute to sediment removal from runoff.

*Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for upland soils:* The proposed action will have no effect on the soils' ability to meet the land health standard.

## **VEGETATION** (includes a finding on Standard 3)

*Affected Environment:* Vegetation on the site of the proposed action is predominately mixed mountain big sagebrush and Utah serviceberry with a diverse understory of perennial grasses and forbs. The ecological site is Loamy slopes/brushy loam.



*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* The proposed action will create about 1.7 acres of earthen disturbance which, if it is promptly recontoured, waterbarred and revegetated will have no long term negative impact on the vegetation on a landscape scale.

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* There will be no change from the present situation.

*Mitigation:* Promptly recontour, waterbar, and revegetate all areas of earthen disturbance with Native Seed mix #2:

Seed Mix #	Species (Variety)	Lbs. PLS per Acre	Range Sites
2	Western wheatgrass (Rosanna)	2	Deep Loam, Loamy 10"-14", Loamy Breaks, Loamy Slopes, Rolling Loam, Valley Bench
	Indian ricegrass (Nezpar)	1	
	Bluebunch wheatgrass (Whitmar)	2	
	Thickspike wheatgrass (Critana)	2	
	Fourwing saltbush	0.5	
	Utah sweetvetch,	0.5	

*Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities* (partial, see also Wildlife, Aquatic and Wildlife, Terrestrial): The proposed action will not have any significant impact on meeting or maintaining the Standard.

## **WILDLIFE, AQUATIC** (includes a finding on Standard 3)

*Affected Environment:* The nearest perennial stream system (Dry Fork of Piceance) is separated from the proposed action by over 3 miles of ephemeral channel. This channel sustains a simple invertebrate-based aquatic system.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* The proposed pipeline route is situated on a mildly sloped ridgeline along an existing road. There is no reasonable likelihood that this limited amount of surface disturbance would generate quantities of sediment capable of reaching, much less affecting, aquatic habitat in the Dry Fork of Piceance.

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* There would be no action authorized that would have potential to deliver sediment to downstream aquatic habitat.

*Mitigation:* None.

*Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities* (partial, see also Vegetation and Wildlife, Terrestrial): There is no reasonable probability that the proposed project or the no-action alternative would have any measurable influence on downstream aquatic habitat conditions nor have any potential to influence the status of land health standards applied to these habitats.

## **WILDLIFE, TERRESTRIAL** (includes a finding on Standard 3)

*Affected Environment:* The project area's higher elevation mountain big sagebrush and Utah serviceberry shrublands are used by deer and elk during the summer through mid-winter months (depending on snow accumulations).

The abundance and composition of nongame bird communities associated with these mixed shrub communities are considered representative and complete with no obvious deficiencies in composition. These shrublands provide no substrate suitable for raptor nesting. Small mammal populations and distribution is poorly documented, however, the 6 or 7 species potentially occurring on these allotments are widely distributed throughout the State and the Great Basin or Rocky Mountain regions. All of these upland associated species display broad ecological tolerance and are documented from habitats ranging from foothill to alpine sites. No narrowly distributed or highly specialized species or sub specific populations are known to occur in the project area.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* The proposed action is scheduled to be constructed in February 2005. This timeframe is well outside sensitive reproductive timeframes of resident wildlife and would occur at a time when snow conditions essentially preclude occupation by big game. With respect to forage and cover availability for big game and nongame species, the small amount of surface disturbance immediately adjacent to an existing well access road would be inconsequential in scale and duration.

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* There would be no action authorized that would have potential to affect resident wildlife populations or the suitability or utility of associated habitats.

*Mitigation:* None.

*Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities* (partial, see also Vegetation and Wildlife, Aquatic): The project area currently meets the public land health standards for animal communities. This project would not jeopardize the viability of any animal population. It would have no significant consequence on terrestrial habitat condition, utility, or function, nor have any discernible affect on animal abundance or distribution at any landscape scale. Therefore, the proposed and no-action alternatives would have no reasonable potential to interfere with the continued meeting of this land health standard.

**OTHER NON-CRITICAL ELEMENTS:** For the following elements, only those brought forward for analysis will be addressed further.

Non-Critical Element	NA or Not Present	Applicable or Present, No Impact	Applicable & Present and Brought Forward for Analysis
Access and Transportation		X	
Cadastral Survey	X		

Non-Critical Element	NA or Not Present	Applicable or Present, No Impact	Applicable & Present and Brought Forward for Analysis
Fire Management	X		
Forest Management	X		
Geology and Minerals	X		
Hydrology/Water Rights	X		
Law Enforcement		X	
Noise		X	
Paleontology			X
Rangeland Management		X	
Realty Authorizations		X	
Recreation			X
Socio-Economics		X	
Visual Resources			X
Wild Horses	X		

## PALEONTOLOGY

*Affected Environment:* The proposed pipeline project is in an area mapped as the Uinta Formation (Tweto 1979) which the BLM has classified as a Condition I formation meaning it is known to produce fossils of scientific interest.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* Should it become necessary to excavate into the underlying bedrock formation to bury the pipeline there is a potential to impact scientifically important fossil resources.

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* There would be no new impacts to fossil resources under the No Action Alternative.

*Mitigation:* 1. A paleontological inventory of all exposed rock outcrops on the proposed pipeline route shall be inventoried by an approved paleontologist with the results of the inventory, along with an recommended mitigation, submitted to the BLM prior to the initiation of any construction.

2. If it should become necessary to excavate into the underlying bedrock formation to bury the pipeline a paleontological monitor shall be present during such excavation.

## RECREATION

*Affected Environment:* The proposed action occurs within the White River Extensive Recreation Management Area (ERMA). BLM custodially manages the ERMA to provide for unstructured recreation activities such as hunting, dispersed camping, hiking, horseback riding, wildlife viewing and off-highway vehicle use.

The project area has been delineated a Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) classes of Semi-Primitive Motorized (SPM) and Roaded Natural (RN). SPM recreation setting is typically characterized by a natural appearing environment with few administrative controls, low interaction between users but evidence of other users may be present. SPM recreation experience is characterized by a high probability of isolation from the sights and sounds of humans that offers an environment that offers challenge and risk. RN setting may have modifications which range from being easily noticed to strongly dominant to observers within the area. There is strong evidence of designed roads and/or highways and frequency of contact is moderate to high on roads; low to moderate on trails and away from roads.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* While pipeline is being constructed an increase in contact frequency is to be expected as well as a decrease in the natural setting due to construction machinery. However, these impacts will be temporal in nature and will cease to persist following completion of pipeline.

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* None.

*Mitigation:* None.

## **VISUAL RESOURCES**

*Affected Environment:* The proposed action is located within a VRM class III area. The objective of this class is to partially retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be moderate. Management activities may attract attention but should not dominate the view of the casual observer. Changes should repeat the basic elements found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* The proposed action (buried pipeline) would be located under the existing roadway. After the pipeline is buried, there would be no visible indication of the presence of the action, except for the above ground required markers indicating the route of the pipeline. These markers would not dominate the view of the casual observer traveling along the access road. The standards of the VRM III classification would be retained.

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* There would be no additional environmental consequences.

*Mitigation:* None

**CUMULATIVE IMPACTS SUMMARY:** Cumulative impacts from oil and gas development were analyzed in the White River Resource Area Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement (PRMP/FEIS) completed in June 1996. Current development, including the proposed action, has not exceeded the foreseeable development analyzed in the PRMP/FEIS.

## **REFERENCES CITED:**

Hillman, Ross G. and Michael D. Metcalf

1978 Western Wyoming College Affidavit of Cultural Resource Inventory PSAP #: 78-CO-047: Northwest Pipeline Corporation: Piceance Creek Gathering System Right-of-way #78186. Western Wyoming Community College, Rock Springs, Wyoming.

Tweto, Ogden

1979 Geologic Map of Colorado. United States Geological Survey, Department of the Interior, Reston, Virginia.

**PERSONS / AGENCIES CONSULTED:** None

**INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Area of Responsibility</b>
Caroline Hollowed	Planning & Environmental Coordinator	Air Quality
Tamara Meagley	Natural Resource Specialist	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern
Tamara Meagley	Natural Resource Specialist	Threatened and Endangered Plant Species
Michael Selle	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources Paleontological Resources
Mark Hafkenschiel	Rangeland Management Specialist	Invasive, Non-Native Species, Vegetation, Rangeland Management
Ed Hollowed	Wildlife Biologist	Migratory Birds
Ed Hollowed	Wildlife Biologist	Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Animal Species, Wildlife
Bo Brown	Hazmat Collateral	Wastes, Hazardous or Solid
Caroline Hollowed	Planning & Environmental Coordinator	Water Quality, Surface and Ground Hydrology and Water Rights
Ed Hollowed	Wildlife Biologist	Wetlands and Riparian Zones
Chris Ham	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Wilderness
Caroline Hollowed	Planning & Environmental Coordinator	Soils
Ed Hollowed	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife Terrestrial and Aquatic
Chris Ham	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Access and Transportation
Ken Holsinger	Natural Resource Specialist	Fire Management
Robert Fowler	Forester	Forest Management
Paul Daggett	Mining Engineer	Geology and Minerals
Penny Brown	Realty Specialist	Realty Authorizations
Chris Ham	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation
Keith Whitaker	Natural Resource Specialist	Visual Resources
Valerie Dobrich	Natural Resource Specialist	Wild Horses

# **Finding of No Significant Impact/Decision Record (FONSI/DR)**

**CO-110-2005-035-EA**

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)/RATIONALE:** The environmental assessment and analyzing the environmental effects of the proposed action have been reviewed. The approved mitigation measures (listed below) result in a Finding of No Significant Impact on the human environment. Therefore, an environmental impact statement is not necessary to further analyze the environmental effects of the proposed action.

**DECISION/RATIONALE:** It is my decision to approve the development of this project as described in the proposed action, with the mitigation measures listed below. This development, with mitigation, is consistent with the decisions in the White River ROD/RMP, and environmental impacts will be minimal.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:** 1. The operator is responsible for informing all persons who are associated with the project operations that they will be subject to prosecution for knowingly disturbing historic or archaeological sites, or for collecting artifacts. If historic or archaeological materials are uncovered during any project or construction activities, the operator is to immediately stop activities in the immediate area of the find that might further disturb such materials, and immediately contact the authorized officer (AO). Within five working days the AO will inform the operator as to:

- whether the materials appear eligible for the National Register of Historic Places
- the mitigation measures the operator will likely have to undertake before the site can be used (assuming in situ preservation is not necessary)
- a timeframe for the AO to complete an expedited review under 36 CFR 800-11 to confirm, through the State Historic Preservation Officer, that the findings of the AO are correct and that mitigation is appropriate.

If the operator wishes, at any time, to relocate activities to avoid the expense of mitigation and/or the delays associated with this process, the AO will assume responsibility for whatever recordation and stabilization of the exposed materials may be required. Otherwise, the operator will be responsible for mitigation cost. The AO will provide technical and procedural guidelines for the conduct of mitigation. Upon verification from the AO that the required mitigation has been completed, the operator will then be allowed to resume construction.

2. Pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(g) the holder of this authorization must notify the AO, by telephone, with written confirmation, immediately upon the discovery of human remains, funerary items, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony. Further, pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(c) and (d), you

must stop activities in the vicinity of the discovery and protect it for 30 days or until notified to proceed by the authorized officer.

3. All disturbances from construction activity for the new flow line must remain within 50 foot either side of the proposed flow line route and between the existing line and the well pad access road.

4. The operator will be responsible for eradicating all noxious, problem and invasive species on the pipeline right of way using materials and methods approved in advance by the Authorized Officer.

5. Pending the leks location relative to RBC 3, a timing limitation of up to 60 days may be installed on this project, generally restricting construction outside the period of March 15 to May 15. There are a number of mitigating features that the applicant may incorporate that would alter the eventual application of this condition of approval, including use of the Cascade Gulch road and use of diel activity restrictions.

6. The operator shall be required to collect and properly dispose of any solid wastes generated by the proposed actions.

7. When preparing the site off the road bed, all suitable topsoil should be stripped from the surface of the location and stockpiled for reclamation once the pipeline is installed.

8. All activity shall cease when soils or road surfaces become saturated to a depth of three inches unless otherwise approved by the Authorized Officer.

9. Provide vegetative or artificial stabilization of cut and fill slopes in the design process. Avoid establishment of vegetation where it inhibits drainage from the road surface or where it restricts safety or maintenance.

10. Slopes within the disturbed area shall be stabilized by non-vegetative practices designed to hold the soil in place and minimize erosion. Vegetative cover shall be reestablished to increase infiltration and provide additional protection from erosion.

11. When erosion is anticipated for any new disturbance off the road bed proper, sediment barriers shall be constructed to slow runoff, allow deposition of sediment, and prevent it from leaving the site. In addition, straining or filtration mechanisms may also contribute to sediment removal from runoff.

12. Promptly recontour, waterbar, and revegetate all areas of earthen disturbance with Native Seed mix #2:

Seed Mix #	Species (Variety)	Lbs. PLS per Acre	Range Sites
2	Western wheatgrass (Rosanna)	2	Deep Loam, Loamy 10"-14",
	Indian ricegrass (Nezpar)	1	Loamy Breaks, Loamy Slopes,
	Bluebunch wheatgrass (Whitmar)	2	Rolling Loam, Valley Bench

Seed Mix #	Species (Variety)	Lbs. PLS per Acre	Range Sites
	Thickspike wheatgrass (Critana)	2	
	Fourwing saltbush	0.5	
	Utah sweetvetch,	0.5	

13. A paleontological inventory of all exposed rock outcrops on the proposed pipeline route shall be inventoried by an approved paleontologist with the results of the inventory, along with an recommended mitigation, submitted to the BLM prior to the initiation of any construction.

14. If it should become necessary to excavate into the underlying bedrock formation to bury the pipeline a paleontological monitor shall be present during such excavation.

**NAME OF PREPARER:** Keith Whitaker

**NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR:** Caroline Hollowed

**SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL:**

  
Field Manager

**DATE SIGNED:** 02/02/05

**ATTACHMENTS:** Location map of the proposed action.



# Location of Proposed Action CO-110-2005-035-EA

